

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	IO. I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/771,977		01/30/2001	Harry van der Pol	040010-937	9429	
27045	7590	05/05/2004		EXAMINER		
	ON INC.		LE, LANA N			
6300 LEC M/S EVR	GACY DRIV LCII	Æ		ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
PLANO,	TX 75024			2685 /Z DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004		
		¥				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/771,977	POL, HARRY VAN DER			
. Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
<b>.</b>	Lana Le	2685			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sneet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a nal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in ondition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the feet (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Office	ite extension e action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	ying the		
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT pla	ace the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were ne	wly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: 8,9 and 24.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 10-23, 25-30.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	, , , , ,				
10. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>			

The newly added limitation of claims 5 and 20 "wherein the calibrating signal is not the output of an oscillator" is new matter that requires further consideration and search. The reference to the second reference, Logan, is the response to the arguments filed 12/03/03 for dependent claim 15, 17, 26 and 28 and not intended for the independent claims. The added new claims that are newly added with reference to the objected claims being made independent appears to be in condition for allowance but is treated as new matter and will not be entered since it is made after the final rejection since the change should have been made before the final rejection.

EDWARD F. URBAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**